



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Q.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,857	08/22/2003	Keun Bae Lee	11036-043-999	1526
24341	7590	04/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO, CA 94306			VU, STEPHEN A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3636		

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/646,857	LEE, KEUN BAE
	Examiner Stephen A Vu	Art Unit 3636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 8/22/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "frame inside the headrest" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the side" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruckert et al (#6,019,424).

Ruckert et al show a seat comprising a headrest supporting frame (18) having a lower end secured to a recliner (19), a seatback frame (3) elastically connected to the headrest support frame, a plurality of elastic connecting means (20) that elastically couple the headrest supporting frame and the seatback frame, and a headrest adjusting bar (22) that adjusts the height of a headrest. The headrest adjusting bar being perpendicularly bent for connecting to the headrest through a side of the headrest. The insert hole has been interpreted to be the hole on the frame that the headrest adjusting bar is inserted though.

With claim 2, the elastic connecting means is at least one tension spring.

With claim 3, the upper end of the headrest adjusting bar is connected to a frame inside the headrest. The lower end of the headrest adjusting bar is adjustably inserted into the inserting hole formed at the upper end of the headrest supporting frame.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elqadah et al (#6,033,017) in view of Mester (#1,251,079).

Elqadah et al show a seat (26) comprising a headrest supporting frame (34) having a bottom end attaching to a seat and a top end for supporting a headrest (16). A seatback frame (12) is disposed within the headrest supporting frame, independent from the headrest supporting frame. However, Elqadah et al do not disclose the use of elastic connectors between the frames.

Mester teaches a headrest member (21) having spring connectors (25) connecting the headrest member to the back member (32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mester's spring connectors (25) to connect the headrest supporting frame to the seatback frame of Elqadah et al's seat, in order to provide a stop limit means to restrict the headrest supporting frame to pivot to a certain angle of degrees relative to the seatback frame.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman (#3,594,037) in view of Mester (#1,251,079).

Elqadah et al show a seat (22) comprising a headrest supporting frame (12) having a bottom end attaching to a seat and a top end for supporting a headrest (48). A seatback frame (28) is disposed within the headrest supporting frame, independent from the headrest supporting frame. The headrest supporting frame has left and right upright members and adjusting members mounted above each upright member defines adjusting holes (58). However, Elqadah et al do not disclose the use of elastic connectors between the frames.

Mester teaches a headrest member (21) having spring connectors (25) connecting the headrest member to the back member (32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mester's spring connectors (25) to connect the headrest supporting frame to the seatback frame of Sherman's seat, in order to define the distance that the seatback frame (28) can move relatively away from the headrest supporting frame (12).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed December 22, 2004, with respect to claims 1-6 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The examiner has conducted another prior art search. The examiner has addressed claims 1-6 with new prior art rejections. Accordingly, this Office action is considered to be Non-final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dal Monte, Robins, Nagashima, Petersen et al, Kruger et al, Hogan et al, and Loose are cited as showing similar types of seat.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A Vu whose telephone number is 703-308-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 am to 7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M Cuomo can be reached on 703-308-0827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Stephen Vu
April 2, 2005